arXiv:1511.08572v2 [math.DS] 30 Nov 2015

Elementary proof of convergence to the mean-field model for the SIR process

Ekkehard Beck*† and Benjamin Armbruster

†*Department of Industrial Engineering and Management Sciences, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, 60208, USA*

December 1, 2015

Abstract

The susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) model has been used extensively to model disease spread and other processes. Despite the widespread usage of this ordinary differential equation (ODE) based model which represents the mean-field approximation of the underlying stochastic SIR process on contact networks, only few rigorous approaches exist and these use complex semigroup and martingale techniques to prove that the expected fraction of the susceptible and infected nodes of the stochastic SIR process on a complete graph converges as the number of nodes increases to the solution of the mean-field ODE model. Extending the elementary proof of convergence for the SIS process introduced by Armbruster and Beck (2015) to the SIR process, we show convergence in mean-square using only a system of three ODEs, simple probabilistic inequalities, and basic ODE theory. Our approach can also be generalized to many other types of compartmental models (e.g., susceptible-infected-recovered-susceptible (SIRS)) which are linear ODEs with the addition of quadratic terms for the number of new infections similar to the SI term in the SIR model.

*Email addresses: ebeck@u.northwestern.edu (Ekkehard Beck), armbrusterb@gmail.com (Benjamin Armbruster)

1 Introduction

In 1927, Kermack and McKendrick (1927) introduced the susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) model to study the plague and cholera epidemics in London and Bombay. Since then, the deterministic, ordinary differential equation (ODE) based SIR model has been extensively used to study the spread of infectious diseases having person-to-person transmission mechanisms (Anderson and May, 1991) and to study similar processes in fields such as host-pathogen biology (May and Anderson, 1983), chemistry (Cardelli, 2008), communications and computer science (Kephart and White, 1993), and social sciences (Daley and Kendall, 1964, 1965).

The popularity of these ODE models is due to their better analytical tractability, allowance for more simple analysis, and low computational complexity in comparison to Markov (also known as state-based) models and individual-based (also known as agent-based) stochastic simulation models (Andersson and Britton, 2000). However, these deterministic ODE models rely on the mean-field or mass-action assumption, i.e., they assume that the population mixes homogeneously (Anderson and May, 1991; Bansal et al., 2007), which, depending on the size of the studied population, might be more (i.e., disease spread in large populations, see e.g., Williams et al. (2006)) or less (i.e., disease spread in small populations, see e.g., Kretzschmar and Wiessing (1999)) realistic (Andersson and Britton, 2000; Keeling and Eames, 2005; Bansal et al., 2007). When choosing the type of model to use, researchers must weigh the accuracy of the proposed model against other factors such as the desired level of analytical tractability, computational performance, availability of data about the underlying network structure, size of the population, and specifics about the disease transmitted (Keeling and Eames, 2005; Bansal et al., 2007; Simon and Kiss, 2012).

Despite the importance of understanding the accuracy of mean-field ODE models, most studies that address this question rely on numerical experiments and only few studies exist that rigorously analyze the accuracy of mean-field ODE models compared to the exact Markov models of the disease spread (Simon and Kiss, 2012). For the continuous-time stochastic SIR process on a complete network, Kurtz (1970, 1971) and Ethier and Kurtz (2005) were first to show that the fraction of nodes in each disease state converges in probability uniformly over finite time intervals to the solution of the mean-field ODE model as the number of nodes increases. These proofs rely on operator semigroup and martingale techniques. In the context of the SIS process, Simon and Kiss

(2012) give a less technical summary of these proofs.

Related to the above approaches are those by Benaïm and Le Boudec (2008) and Bortolussi et al. (2013) which prove for the same setting convergence in probability (Bortolussi et al., 2013) and in mean-square (Benaïm and Le Boudec, 2008). Starting out with a discrete-time Markov chain (DTMC), they prove convergence of the corresponding continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC) to the mean-field ODE model using martingale and stochastic approximation algorithms techniques. Besides these approaches, we are not aware of further studies which use significantly different or less complex techniques to prove convergence of the stochastic SIR-process to the classical mean-field ODE model as introduced by Kermack and McKendrick (1927). Similar, convergence results also exist for variants of the SIR-models different to the classical one such as the SIR model on a configuration model network specified by an arbitrary degree distribution (Volz, 2008) where convergence to the deterministic limit was proved by Decreusefond et al. (2012) using again complex techniques drawn from stochastic differential equations (SDE) and martingale theory.

Recently, Armbruster and Beck (2015) introduced an elementary approach to show convergence for the SIS process. Using only a system of two ODEs, basic ODE techniques, and Jensen's inequality, they show that the dynamics of the fraction of infected in the continuous-time stochastic SIS-process on a complete graph converges uniformly over finite time intervals in mean-square to the mean-field ODE as the population size increases. However, that approach cannot be easily extended since it requires the mean-field ODE to be one-dimensional. This inspired us to develop in this paper a more general approach for the SIR process and prove that the fractions of susceptibles and infected nodes of the stochastic SIR-process on a complete graph converges uniformly over finite time intervals in mean-square to the solution of the mean-field ODE model as the number of nodes in the network increases. The approach remains elementary, using only a system of three ODEs describing the dynamics of the fraction of susceptibles and infected and the dynamics of the total stochasticity in the system; simple probability inequalities to bound the difference of the stochastic $\mathrm{E}[SI]$, $\mathrm{E}[S^2I]$, and $\mathrm{E}[SI^2]$ terms from the mean-field equations; and basic ODE techniques. Our approach not only proves a stronger result than the approach of Kurtz (1970, 1971) and Ethier and Kurtz (2005) who proved convergence in probability but more importantly provides a shorter and more elementary approach than the existing approaches discussed (Kurtz, 1970, 1971; Ethier and Kurtz, 2005; Benaïm and Le Boudec, 2008; Bortolussi et al., 2013). Extending our previous approach

(Armbruster and Beck, 2015)) to the SIR process forwards our agenda of showing that mean-field convergence results can be tackled using only basic probability and ODE theory, since we hope to open up the field to more researchers that might not be comfortable using semigroup or martingale theory. Going further in this direction, we show in the discussion section that this approach can be also extended to other types of compartmental models such as the susceptible-infected-recovered-susceptible (SIRS), susceptible-exposed-infected-recovered (SEIR), or susceptible-exposed-infected-susceptible (SEIS)) models which are linear ODEs with the addition of nonlinear (i.e., quadratic) terms for the number of new infections similar to the quadratic $S \cdot I$ term in the SIR model.

2 Theorem

Consider a complete graph of n nodes and let $X_n(t)$ be a Markov process describing the state of nodes at time t. Each node can be in one of the three states: susceptible S, infected I, and recovered R (immune). An infected node infects each susceptible neighbor at a rate τ/n and recovers at rate γ. We define $S_n(t) := \text{num}_S(X_n(t))$ and $I_n(t) := \text{num}_I(X_n(t))$ as the number of susceptible and infected nodes, and $s_n(t) := S_n(t)/n$ and $i_n(t) := I_n(t)/n$ as the susceptible and the infected fraction, respectively. Clearly, the number of recovered nodes is $R_n(t) := \text{num}_R(X_n(t)) = n - S_n(t) - I_n(t)$. Over the course of this paper we may sometimes drop the dependence on t and n in our notation.

Our goal is to prove the following theorem, which shows that the dynamics of the expectation of the fraction of susceptible and infected nodes of the stochastic SIR process converges in mean-square on a complete graph and finite-time intervals to the mean-field approximation as the population size increases.

Theorem 1. *If $s_n(0) = s_0$ and $i_n(0) = i_0$ for all n and s_0 and $i_0 \in [0, 1]$, then as $n \to \infty$, $(s_n(t), i_n(t))$ converges uniformly in mean square, i.e.,*

$$\mathrm{E}[\|(s_n(t), i_n(t)) - y(t)\|^2] \to 0,$$

on any time finite interval $[0, T]$ *to the solution of the mean-field equations:*

$$y_1' = -\tau y_1 y_2, \quad y_1(0) = s_0, \tag{1a}$$

$$y_2' = \tau y_1 y_2 - \gamma y_2, \quad y_2(0) = i_0. \tag{1b}$$

3 Proof of Theorem 1

3.1 Preliminaries

In this subsection we outline our approach and handle some routine technicalities. In the following subsection we establish the set of differential equations which describe the dynamics of the first and second moments of the fractions of nodes of the stochastic SIR process. The problem with those differential equations is the presence of $\mathrm{E}[si]$, $\mathrm{E}[s^2 i]$, and $\mathrm{E}[si^2]$ terms on the right hand sides. Then in section 3.3 we develop bounds for these terms. These then allow us in section 3.4 to obtain a system of ODEs equivalent to that in section 3.2 but which is closed, so that the right hand sides are functions of the variables on the left hand sides. The system of ODEs describes the dynamics of the expectations and the dynamics of the sum of the variances. Finally in section 3.5, we bound the solution of these ODEs to the solution of the mean-field equations (1).

Existence and uniqueness. Since the right hand sides of equations (1) are smooth (i.e., continuously differentiable), a unique solution exists to the mean-field equations. Further, since it is easy to see that $(y_1(t), y_2(t))$ remains in $[0, 1]^2$, the solution exists for all times t.

3.2 Initial set of differential equations

Let $\mathrm{num}_{SI}(X(t))$ be the number of edges which connect a susceptible and an infected individual. Since we are on a complete network, $\mathrm{num}_{SI}(X(t)) = \mathrm{num}_S(X(t))\,\mathrm{num}_I(X(t))$.

Proposition 2. *The following differential equations hold:*

$$\text{(2a)} \qquad \mathrm{E}[S]' = -(\tau/n)\,\mathrm{E}[SI],$$

$$\text{(2b)} \qquad \mathrm{E}[I]' = (\tau/n)\,\mathrm{E}[SI] - \gamma\,\mathrm{E}[I],$$

$$\text{(2c)} \qquad \mathrm{E}[S^2]' = -(\tau/n)(2\,\mathrm{E}[S^2 I] - \mathrm{E}[SI]),$$

$$\text{(2d)} \qquad \mathrm{E}[I^2]' = -(\tau/n)(2\,\mathrm{E}[SI^2] + \mathrm{E}[SI]) - \gamma(2\,\mathrm{E}[I^2] - \mathrm{E}[I]).$$

Proof. These equations can be found in papers focusing on pair-models which build on them (Keeling, 1999; Rand, 1999). Our proof is more formal and takes the same approach as in Proposition 2 of Armbruster and Beck (2015), which proves a similar result for the SIS process. Formally, for each equation in (2) we are merely using the Kolmogorov backward equations (see any undergraduate textbook such as Ross (2000)) where for a Markov process $X(t)$ with transition rate matrix Q and any function $a(x)$,

$$\mathrm{E}[a(X(t))]' = \mathrm{E}[b(X(t))],$$

where we define

$$b(x) := \sum_{\hat{x}} Q(x, \hat{x}).$$

Using the fact that $Q(x, \hat{x}) = -\sum_{x \neq \hat{x}} Q(x, \hat{x})$,

$$b(x) = \sum_{x \neq \hat{x}} Q(x, \hat{x})(a(\hat{x}) - a(x)).$$

The terms in the sum are products of the transition rates and the size of the resulting changes in $a(X(t))$. In our case, we only need to handle two types of transitions: the network configuration, x, can transition to states $\hat{x}$ with either an additional infection or an infection that recovered. The first occurs at an aggregate rate of $(\tau/n)\,\mathrm{num}_{SI}(x)$ while the second at rate $\gamma\,\mathrm{num}_I(x)$. Transitions due to an additional infection increase the number of infected and decrease the number of susceptibles by one, $\mathrm{num}_I(\hat{x}) - \mathrm{num}_I(x) = 1$ and $\mathrm{num}_S(\hat{x}) - \mathrm{num}_S(x) = -1$. Choosing $a(x) = \mathrm{num}_I(x)$ and

$a(x) = \text{num}_S(x)$, then explains (2a) and (2b), respectively. We explain (2c) and (2d) by choosing $a(x) = \text{num}_S(x)^2$ and $a(x) = \text{num}_I(x)^2$, respectively, and noting that for an additional infection,

$$\text{num}_S(\hat{x})^2 - \text{num}_S(x)^2 = (\text{num}_S(x) - 1)^2 - \text{num}_S(x)^2 = -(2\,\text{num}_S(x) - 1),$$

$$\text{num}_I(\hat{x})^2 - \text{num}_I(x)^2 = (\text{num}_I(x) + 1)^2 - \text{num}_I(x)^2 = 2\,\text{num}_I(x) + 1,$$

while for a transition due to an infection that recovered, $\text{num}_S(\hat{x}) = \text{num}_S(x)$ and

$$\text{num}_I(\hat{x})^2 - \text{num}_I(x)^2 = (\text{num}_I(x) - 1)^2 - \text{num}_I(x)^2 = -(2\,\text{num}_I(x) - 1).$$

□

Normalizing the equations (2a)–(2d) we obtain,

(3a) $$\text{E}[s]' = -\tau\,\text{E}[si],$$

(3b) $$\text{E}[i]' = \tau\,\text{E}[si] - \gamma\,\text{E}[i],$$

(3c) $$\text{E}[s^2]' = -\tau(2\,\text{E}[s^2 i] - \text{E}[si]/n),$$

(3d) $$\text{E}[i^2]' = \tau(2\,\text{E}[si^2] + \text{E}[si]/n) - \gamma(2\,\text{E}[i^2] - \text{E}[i]/n).$$

This highlights the $O(1/n)$ terms that disappear as $n \to \infty$. Figure 1 illustrates this for a numerical example. The difficulty with these equations, (3), is that they are not closed, because they do not describe how to evaluate the product terms (i.e., $\text{E}[si]$, $\text{E}[s^2 i]$, and $\text{E}[si^2]$) on the right hand sides.

3.3 Bounds on the expectation of products

Using Lemma 3 we bound the difference of the expectations of the product terms in (3) (i.e., $\text{E}[si]$, $\text{E}[s^2 i]$, and $\text{E}[si^2]$) to the corresponding product of expectations (i.e., $\text{E}[s]\,\text{E}[i]$, $\text{E}[s]^2\,\text{E}[i]$, and $\text{E}[s]\,\text{E}[i]^2$).



Figure 1: SIR epidemic fraction of susceptibles with $\tau = 3, \gamma = 0.25$. The solution of the mean-field equations (1) (black curve) in comparison to the expected fraction, $\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)]$, calculated using the Kolmogorov equations, for increasing number of nodes: $n = 10$ (blue curve), $n = 30$ (red curve), and $n = 100$ (green curve).

Lemma 3. *For random variables Y and Z in $[0, 1]$,*

$$|\mathrm{E}[YZ] - \mathrm{E}[Y]\,\mathrm{E}[Z]| \leq (\mathrm{Var}[Y] + \mathrm{Var}[Z])/2, \tag{4a}$$

$$\left|\mathrm{E}[Y^2 Z] - \mathrm{E}[Y]^2\,\mathrm{E}[Z]\right| \leq \mathrm{Var}[Y] + \mathrm{Var}[Z]. \tag{4b}$$

Proof. From the facts that $\mathrm{Cov}[Y, Z] = \mathrm{E}[YZ] - \mathrm{E}[Y]\,\mathrm{E}[Z]$, $\mathrm{Cov}[Y, Z] = \mathrm{corr}[Y, Z]\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}[Y]\,\mathrm{Var}[Z]}$, and $|\mathrm{corr}[Y, Z]| \leq 1$, we have

$$|\mathrm{E}[YZ] - \mathrm{E}[Y]\,\mathrm{E}[Z]| \leq \sqrt{\mathrm{Var}[Y]\,\mathrm{Var}[Z]}. \tag{5}$$

Applying Lemma 4,

$$\left|\mathrm{E}[Y^2 Z] - \mathrm{E}[Y]^2\,\mathrm{E}[Z]\right| \leq 2\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}[Y]\,\mathrm{Var}[Z]}. \tag{6}$$

The fact that the arithmetic mean is greater than the geometric mean,

$$\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}[Y]\operatorname{Var}[Z]} \leq (\operatorname{Var}[Y] + \operatorname{Var}[Z])/2,$$

then proves the claims. □

Lemma 4. *Consider a random variables Y in $[0,1]$. Then $\operatorname{Var}[Y^2] \leq 4\operatorname{Var}[Y]$.*

Proof. This proof is adapted from Giraudo (2014). Note that $Y^2 = (Y - \mathrm{E}[Y])Y + \mathrm{E}[Y]Y$. Applying Lemma 5, we obtain

$$\operatorname{Var}[Y^2] \leq 2(\operatorname{Var}[(Y - \mathrm{E}[Y])Y] + \operatorname{Var}[\mathrm{E}[Y]Y]). \tag{7}$$

From the definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Var}[(Y - \mathrm{E}[Y])Y] &= \mathrm{E}[((Y - \mathrm{E}[Y]Y)^2] - \mathrm{E}[(Y - \mathrm{E}[Y])Y]^2 \\ &\leq \mathrm{E}[((Y - \mathrm{E}[Y])Y^2] \leq \mathrm{E}[(Y - \mathrm{E}[Y])^2] = \operatorname{Var}[Y]\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to $|Y| \leq 1$. Substituting back into (7), we obtain

$$\operatorname{Var}[Y^2] \leq 2(\operatorname{Var}[Y] + \mathrm{E}[Y]^2 \operatorname{Var}[Y]) \leq 4\operatorname{Var}[Y].$$

□

The following example shows that the factor of 4 in Lemma 4 is tight. Consider $P[Y = 1] = P[Y = 1 - 2\delta] = 1/2$. Then $\operatorname{Var}[Y] = \delta^2$ and $\operatorname{Var}[Y^2] = 4\delta^2(1 - 2\delta + \delta^2)$, which asymptotically equals $4\delta^2$ as $\delta \to 0$.

Lemma 5. *For random variables Y and Z, $\operatorname{Var}[Y + Z] \leq 2(\operatorname{Var}[Y] + \operatorname{Var}[Z])$.*

Proof. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Var}[Y+Z] &= \operatorname{Var}[Y] + \operatorname{Var}[Z] + 2\operatorname{corr}(Y,Z)\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}[Y]\operatorname{Var}[Z]},\\ &\leq \operatorname{Var}[Y] + \operatorname{Var}[Z] + 2\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}[Y]\operatorname{Var}[Z]},\\ &\leq \operatorname{Var}[Y] + \operatorname{Var}[Z] + 2(\operatorname{Var}[Y]\operatorname{Var}[Z])/2,\\ &= 2(\operatorname{Var}[Y] + \operatorname{Var}[Z]),\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because the geometric mean is less than or equal to the arithmetic mean. □

We now apply Lemma 3 to $\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)i_n(t)]$, $\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)^2 i_n(t)]$, and $\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)i_n(t)^2]$. We can replace the inequality in (4) by defining the corresponding functions $h_{1,n}(t), h_{2,n}(t)$, and $h_{3,n}(t)$ in $[-1,1]$ such that

$$\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)i_n(t)] = \mathrm{E}[s_n(t)]\,\mathrm{E}[i_n(t)] + h_{1,n}(t)(\operatorname{Var}[s_n(t)] + \operatorname{Var}[i_n(t)])/2, \tag{8a}$$

$$\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)^2 i_n(t)] = \mathrm{E}[s_n(t)]^2\,\mathrm{E}[i_n(t)] + h_{2,n}(t)(\operatorname{Var}[s_n(t)] + \operatorname{Var}[i_n(t)]), \tag{8b}$$

$$\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)i_n(t)^2] = \mathrm{E}[s_n(t)]\,\mathrm{E}[i_n(t)]^2 + h_{3,n}(t)(\operatorname{Var}[s_n(t)] + \operatorname{Var}[i_n(t)]). \tag{8c}$$

We also define $h_{4,n}(t)$ in $[0,1]$ such that

$$\operatorname{Var}[i_n(t)] = h_{4,n}(t)(\operatorname{Var}[s_n(t)] + \operatorname{Var}[i_n(t)]), \tag{8d}$$

which we will require in the next step, where we establish an system of ODEs equivalent to equations (3) using only the two mean-field equations (3a)–(3b) and an equation describing the dynamics of the total variance in the system.

3.4 Closed system of ODEs

Since the inequalities in Lemma 3 involve the variance, it will be convenient to replace (3c)–(3d) by an equation for $(\operatorname{Var}[s] + \operatorname{Var}[i])'$, representing the dynamics of the total stochasticity in the

system. Since $\mathrm{Var}[Y] = \mathrm{E}[Y^2] - \mathrm{E}[Y]^2$, it follows that $\mathrm{Var}[Y]' = \mathrm{E}[Y^2]' - 2\,\mathrm{E}[Y]\,\mathrm{E}[Y]'$ and thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}[s]' &= -\tau(2\,\mathrm{E}[s^2 i] - \mathrm{E}[si]/n) + 2\tau\,\mathrm{E}[s]\,\mathrm{E}[si] \\
&= -2\tau\,\mathrm{E}[s^2 i] + \tau\,\mathrm{E}[si](2\,\mathrm{E}[s] + 1/n), \\
\mathrm{Var}[i]' &= \tau(2\,\mathrm{E}[si^2] + \mathrm{E}[si]/n) - \gamma(2\,\mathrm{E}[i^2] - \mathrm{E}[i]/n) - 2\,\mathrm{E}[i](\tau\,\mathrm{E}[si] - \gamma\,\mathrm{E}[i]) \\
&= 2\tau\,\mathrm{E}[si^2] + \tau\,\mathrm{E}[si](-2\,\mathrm{E}[i] + 1/n) - 2\gamma\,\mathrm{Var}[i] + \gamma\,\mathrm{E}[i]/n, \\
(\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i])' &= 2\tau(\mathrm{E}[si^2] - \mathrm{E}[s^2 i]) \\
&\quad + 2\tau\,\mathrm{E}[si](\mathrm{E}[s] - \mathrm{E}[i] + 1/n) - 2\gamma\,\mathrm{Var}[i] + \gamma\,\mathrm{E}[i]/n.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Hence our current system of differential equations is (3a),(3b), and (9). We now use the substitutions defined in (8) for $\mathrm{E}[si]$, $\mathrm{E}[s^2 i]$, and $\mathrm{E}[si^2]$ to obtain the following system of ODEs:

$$\mathrm{E}[s]' = -\tau(\mathrm{E}[s]\,\mathrm{E}[i] + h_1(\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i])/2), \tag{10a}$$

$$\mathrm{E}[i]' = \tau(\mathrm{E}[s]\,\mathrm{E}[i] + h_1(\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i])/2) - \gamma\,\mathrm{E}[i], \tag{10b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i])' &= 2\tau(\mathrm{E}[s]\,\mathrm{E}[i]^2 + h_3(\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i])) \\
&\quad - 2\tau(\mathrm{E}[s]^2\,\mathrm{E}[i] + h_2(\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i])) \\
&\quad + 2\tau(\mathrm{E}[s]\,\mathrm{E}[i] + h_1(\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i])/2)(\mathrm{E}[s] - \mathrm{E}[i] + 1/n) \\
&\quad - 2\gamma h_4(\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i]) + \gamma\,\mathrm{E}[i]/n, \\
&= (2\tau(h_3 - h_2) + \tau h_1(\mathrm{E}[s] - \mathrm{E}[i] + 1/n) - 2\gamma h_4) \\
&\quad \cdot (\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i]) + (2\tau\,\mathrm{E}[s]\,\mathrm{E}[i] + \gamma\,\mathrm{E}[i])/n.
\end{aligned} \tag{10c}$$

Equations (10a)–(10c) define a proper system of differential equations with the same variables ($\mathrm{E}[s]$, $\mathrm{E}[i]$, and $\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i]$) on the right hand side as on the left hand side. To be more explicit, we define the vector $z_n := (\mathrm{E}[s_n], \mathrm{E}[i_n], \mathrm{Var}[s_n] + \mathrm{Var}[i_n])$. As with the original state variables S and i, we may sometimes write z or h_k, dropping the dependence on n and t. Thus, $z_n(t)$ is a

solution of the initial value problem, $z' = g_n(t, z; 1/n)$ and $z(0) = z_0$, where

$$g_{1,n}(t, z; \epsilon) := -\tau(z_1 z_2 + h_{1,n}(t) z_3/2), \tag{11a}$$

$$g_{2,n}(t, z; \epsilon) := \tau(z_1 z_2 + h_{1,n}(t) z_3/2) - \gamma z_2, \tag{11b}$$

$$\begin{aligned} g_{3,n}(t, z; \epsilon) := {} & (2\tau(h_{3,n}(t) - h_{2,n}(t)) + \tau h_{1,n}(t)(z_1 - z_2 + \epsilon) - 2\gamma h_{4,n}(t)) z_3 \\ & + (2\tau z_1 z_2 + \gamma z_2)\epsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{11c}$$

$$z_0 := (s_0, i_0, 0). \tag{11d}$$

Note that the mean-field solution, $\bar{z}(t) := (y_1(t), y_2(t), 0)$, solves (for any n) the initial value problem $z' = g_n(t, z; 0)$ and $z(0) = z_0$. Our next step is to bound $\|z_n - \bar{z}\|$.

3.5 Convergence

Lemma 6. *Consider the initial value problems $x' = f_1(t, x)$, $x(0) = x_0$ and $x' = f_2(t, x)$, $x(0) = x_0$ with solutions $\varphi_1(t)$ and $\varphi_2(t)$ respectively. If f_1 is Lipschitz in x with constant L and $\|f_1(t, x) - f_2(t, x)\| \le M$, then $\|\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t)\| \le (M/L)(e^{Lt} - 1)$.*

Proof. This is a standard result in ODE theory, whose proof we give in the Appendix. □

To apply Lemma 6 we first note that the domain of z for $g_n(t, z; \epsilon)$ is bounded: $\mathrm{E}[s]$ and $\mathrm{E}[i]$ are in $[0, 1]$ and $\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i]$ is in $[0, 2]$. The domain for ϵ is $[0, 1]$. Since $g_n(t, z; 0)$ is a polynomial in z, we can determine a Lipschitz constant with respect to z by bounding $\sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \left| \frac{\delta g_{j,n}}{\delta x_k} \right|$. Using the bounds on the domain, on ϵ, and on the functions $h_{k,n}$, $k = 1, \ldots, 4$, we determine that $L = 18\tau + 2\gamma$ is such a Lipschitz constant. Using the bounds on z and the functions $h_{k,n}$, we define $M(\epsilon)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_n(t, z; \epsilon) - g_n(t, z; 0)\| &= |g_{3,n}(t, z; \epsilon) - g_{3,n}(t, z; 0)| \\ &= |\tau h_{1,n}(t)\epsilon z_3 + (2\tau z_1 z_2 + \gamma z_2)\epsilon| \\ &\le (4\tau + \gamma)\epsilon =: M(\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

We now apply Lemma 6 by letting $f_1(t, x) = g_n(t, x; 0)$, $f_2(t, x) = g_n(t, x, 1/n)$, $x_0 = z_0$, $\varphi_1 = \bar{z}$,

and $\varphi_2 = z_n$. Then the difference between $z_n(t)$ and $\bar{z}(t)$ is

$$\|z_n(t) - \bar{z}(t)\| \leq \frac{M(1/n)}{L}(e^{Lt} - 1),$$

Thus, for $t \leq T$,

$$\|z_n(t) - \bar{z}(t)\| \leq \frac{M(1/n)}{L}(e^{LT} - 1). \tag{12}$$

Since $M(\epsilon)$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, the right hand side of (12) goes to zero as $n \to \infty$. Hence we have uniform convergence of $z_n \to \bar{z}$ over any finite time interval $[0, T]$.

We now show that $z_n \to \bar{z}$ implies convergence in mean-square, i.e., $\mathrm{E}[\|(s_n, i_n)\|^2] \to 0$. In finite dimensions, all norms are equivalent for the purposes of proving convergence. For convenience we choose the 2-norm for $\|(s_n, i_n) - y\|_2$ and the 1-norm for $\|z_n - \bar{z}\|_1$. Recalling that $\mathrm{Var}[Y] = \mathrm{E}[Y^2] - \mathrm{E}[Y]^2$, we decompose the mean-square error into a bias and a variance term:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[\|(s_n, i_n) - y\|_2^2] &= \mathrm{E}[(s_n - y_1)^2] + \mathrm{E}[(i_n - y_2)^2] \\
&= (\mathrm{E}[s_n] - y_1)^2 + (\mathrm{E}[i_n] - y_2)^2 + \mathrm{Var}[s_n] + \mathrm{Var}[i_n] \\
&\leq |\mathrm{E}[s_n] - y_1| + |\mathrm{E}[i_n] - y_2| + \mathrm{Var}[s_n] + \mathrm{Var}[i_n] \\
&= |z_{n,1} - \bar{z}_1| + |z_{n,1} - z_1| + |z_3 - z_{n,3}| = \|z_n - \bar{z}\|_1
\end{aligned}$$

where of course $z_{n,3} = 0$, and the inequality holds because $z_{n,1}, z_{n,2}$ in $[0, 1]$. Thus uniform convergence of $\|z_n - \bar{z}\|_1 \to 0$ for $t \leq T$ implies the same for $\mathrm{E}[\|(s_n, i_n) - y\|_2^2] \to 0$, proving our claim.

4 Discussion

We extended the elementary approach of Armbruster and Beck (2015) to show that the expected fractions of nodes of the stochastic SIR process on a complete graph converge uniformly in mean-square on finite time intervals to the solution of the mean-field ODE model. Choosing the first and second moments of the infected and susceptibles as the state variables of the stochastic SIR process we established a system of four ODEs (see Proposition 2). We normalized the state variables

and then manipulated this system of ODEs to show that their solution converges to the solution of the mean-field equations. Our main tool was Lemma 3, two simple probabilistic inequalities involving expectations and variances, which allow us to bound the difference of the stochastic terms $\mathrm{E}[si]$,$\mathrm{E}[si^2]$,and $\mathrm{E}[si^2]$ from the corresponding mean-field terms. Applying Lemma 3 we closed the system of ODEs so that the right hand side is a function of the variables on the left hand side and arrived at a system of three ODEs, two equations for the means ($\mathrm{E}[s]$ and $\mathrm{E}[i]$) and one for the total stochasticity in the system (i.e., $\mathrm{Var}[s] + \mathrm{Var}[i]$). To ensure that the right hand side of the differential equations (10) is Lipschitz, which is needed for Lemma 6, we bounded the square root terms in equations (5) and (6) by arithmetic means. Finally to prove the claim, we simply applied the standard bound from the theorem for the continuous dependence of parameters of ODE solutions.

We want to note that our elementary approach generalizes to related epidemic models such as the susceptible-infected-recovered-susceptible (SIRS), susceptible-exposed-infected-susceptible (SEIS), and susceptible-exposed-infected-recovered (SEIR) model. The corresponding mean-field models are linear ODEs with the addition of quadratic terms for the number of new infections (i.e., the $S \cdot I$ term in equations (1a)–(1b)). We go through the key steps to generalization using the SEIR model as an example. First, the existing differential equations in the ODE systems (2) and (3) have to be modified for the SEIR model and differential equations have to be added which describe the dynamics of the first and second moments of the additional state variable (i.e., the fraction of nodes exposed). Applying Lemma 3 we again bound the difference of the stochastic $\mathrm{E}[si]$, $\mathrm{E}[s^2i]$, and $\mathrm{E}[si^2]$ terms from the mean-field equations since the SEIR and all the other models discussed above have the same or a similar quadratic terms for the rate of new infections. To establish the ODE system equivalent to (10), we first add the variance of the fraction exposed to the equation for the total stochasticity (9). We then add the variance of the exposed fraction to the right hand side of (8d) and add a similar equation defining $h_{5,n}$ with the variance of the exposed fraction on the left hand side. Thus, the resulting equivalent ODE system consists of the mean-field equations describing the dynamics of all the expected fraction of nodes as in style of (10a) and (10b) and one equation describing the dynamics of the total variance in the system (10c). Then Section 3.5 can be used to prove convergence.

Going further, we point out that some choices for $h_{k,n}(t)$ when solving (11) appear to give lower



Figure 2: Fraction of susceptibles of SIR process: the true expectation, $\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)]$ (blue dashed curve); the mean-field approximation, $y_1(t)$ (black curve); apparent upper (green dashed-dotted curve) and lower (red dotted curve) bounds on $\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)]$. The upper and lower bounds correspond to component $z_1(t)$ of solutions to $z' = g_n(t, z; 1/n), z(0) = z_0$ (see (11)) where we set $(h_{1,n}, h_{2,n}, h_{3,n}, h_{4,n})$ to constants: $(0.5, 1, 0.5, 1)$ for the lower bound and $(-1, -0.8, -0.4, 0.5)$ for the upper bound in panels A, B, and C; and $(0.5, 1, 0.5, 1)$ for the lower bound and $(-1, -1, -0.75, 1)$ for the upper bound in panels D, E, and F. The panels vary the number of nodes $(n = 10, 30, 100)$ and the transmission rate $(\tau = 1, 3)$. The recovery rate is $\gamma = 0.25$.

or upper bounds on $\mathrm{E}[s_n(t)]$ or $\mathrm{E}[i_n(t)]$ (see Lemma 3, (8a)–(8c), and (10)). Figure 2 shows the fraction of susceptibles for some numerical examples where this appears to be the case. In those examples we set the $h_{k,n}(t)$ to constants. It is worth noting that while the upper bounds are only tight until some finite time T (which of course increases as $n \to \infty$) after which they diverge to infinity, the lower bounds appear to be tight for all times. Whether these observations can be proven is an area for further research. An additional area for future research is proving that the uniform convergence holds for all times and not just a finite interval.

In comparison to the classical approach by Kurtz (1970, 1971) and Ethier and Kurtz (2005) showing convergence in probability, we not only proved a stronger result (i.e., convergence in mean-square) but also provided a shorter, more elementary proof than existing ones. This extension of our previously introduced elementary approach (Armbruster and Beck, 2015) to the SIR case forwards our agenda of showing that mean-field convergence results can be tackled using only basic ODE theory. Using this approach, we hope to open up the field to more researchers that might not be comfortable using semigroup or martingale theory and allow more researchers to rigorously analyze the accuracy of compartmental models.

Acknowledgements. We thank Peter L. Simon for helpful comments.

References

Anderson, R. M. and May, R. M. (1991). *Infectious Diseases of Humans Dynamics and Control*. Oxford University Press.

Andersson, H. and Britton, T. (2000). *Stochastic epidemic models and their statistical analysis. Lecture Notes in Statistics*. Springer.

Armbruster, B. and Beck, E. (2015). An elementary proof of convergence to the mean-field equations for an epidemic model. *arXiv:1501.03250*.

Bansal, S., Grenfell, B. T., and Meyers, L. A. (2007). When individual behaviour matters: homogeneous and network models in epidemiology. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 4(16):879–891.

Benaïm, M. and Le Boudec, J.-Y. (2008). A class of mean-field interaction models for computer and communication systems. *Performance Evaluation*, 65(11-12):823–838.

Bortolussi, L., Hillston, J., Latella, D., and Massink, M. (2013). Continous approximation of collective system behavior: A tutorial. *Performance Evaluation*, 70(5):317–349.

Cardelli, L. (2008). From processes to ODEs by chemistry. *TCNature, International Federation for Information Processing (Springer, Boston)*, 273:261–281.

Daley, D. and Kendall, D. (1964). Epidemics and rumours. *Nature*, 204(225):1118.

Daley, D. and Kendall, D. (1965). Stochastic rumors. *IMA*, 1(1):42–55.

Decreusefond, L., Dhersin, J.-S., Moyal, P., and Chi Tran, V. (2012). Large graph limit for an SIR process in random network with heterogeneous connectivity. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 22(2):541–575.

Ethier, S. N. and Kurtz, T. G. (2005). *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley series in probability and statistics. Wiley.

Giraudo, D. (2014). Bound the variance of the product of two random varables. Mathematics Stack Exchange. URL:http://math.stackexchange.com/q/1044864 (version: 2014-11-30).

Hale, J. (2009). *Ordinary Differential Equations*. Dover Books on Mathematics Series. Dover Publications.

Keeling, M. J. (1999). The effects of local spatial structure on epidemiological invasions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B*, 266:859–867.

Keeling, M. J. and Eames, K. T. D. (2005). Networks and epidemic models. *J. R. Soc. Interface*, 2:295–307.

Kephart, J. and White, S. (1993). Measuring and modeling computer virus prevalence. *Proceedings, 1993 IEEE Computer Society Symposium on Research in Security and Privacy*, pages 2–15.

Kermack, W. and McKendrick, A. (1927). A contribution to the mathmatical theory of epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character*, 115(772):700–721.

Kretzschmar, M. and Wiessing, L. (1999). Modelling the spread of hiv in social networks of injecting drug users. *AIDS*, 12(7):801–811.

Kurtz, T. G. (1970). Solutions of ordinary differential equations as limits of pure jump Markov processes. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 7:49–58.

Kurtz, T. G. (1971). Limit theorems for sequences of jump Markov processes approximating ordinary differential processes. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 8(2):344–356.

May, R. M. and Anderson, R. M. (1983). Epidemiology and genetics in the coevolution of parasites and hosts. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, 219(1216):281–313.

Rand, D. A. (1999). Correlation equations and pair approximations for spatial ecologies. *CWI Quarterly*, 12(3&4):329–368.

Ross, S. (2000). *Introduction to Probability Models*. Academic Press, 7th edition.

Simon, P. L. and Kiss, I. Z. (2012). From exact stochastic to mean-field ODE models: a case study of three different approaches to prove convergence results. *IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics*, pages 1–20.

Volz, E. (2008). SIR dynamics in random networks with heterogeneous connectivity. *J Math Biol*, 56(3):293–310.

Williams, B., Lloyd-Smith, J., Gouws, E., Hankins, C., Getz, W., Hangrove, J., de Zoysa, I., and Auvert, B. (2006). The potential impact of male circumcision on HIV in Sub-Saharan Africa. *PloS Med*, 3(7):e262.

Appendix

Lemma 6. *Consider the initial value problems* $x' = f_1(t,x)$, $x(0) = x_0$ *and* $x' = f_2(t,x)$, $x(0) = x_0$ *with solutions* $\varphi_1(t)$ *and* $\varphi_2(t)$ *respectively. If* f_1 *is Lipschitz in* x *with constant* L *and* $\|f_1(t,x) - f_2(t,x)\| \leq M$, *then* $\|\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t)\| \leq (M/L)(e^{Lt} - 1)$.

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\|f_1(t,x_1) - f_2(t,x_2)\| &\leq \|f_1(t,x_1) - f_1(t,x_2)\| + \|f_1(t,x_2) - f_2(t,x_2)\| \\ &\leq L\|x_1 - x_2\| + M.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\theta(t) := \|\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t)\|$. Then $\theta(0) = 0$ and

$$\theta(t)' \leq \|f_1(t,\varphi_1(t)) - f_2(t,\varphi_2(t))\| \leq L\theta(t) + M.$$

Applying the Comparison Lemma then gives the result. □

Comparison Lemma. *Suppose that* $a(t)$ *and* $b(t)$ *are scalar;* f *is smooth;* $a(0) \leq b(0)$; *and* $a'(t) \leq f(a(t))$ *and* $b'(t) = f(b(t))$ *for* $0 \leq t \leq T$. *Then* $a(t) \leq b(t)$ *for* $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. The proof of this intuitive result can be found in any graduate ODE text such as Theorem 6.1 in Hale (2009). □